REMARKS

These remarks are in reply to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006 (Paper No./Mail Date 20060415).

Claims 1-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. to Li[1] ("Li"). Applicant respectively traverses the rejections as the Li reference fails to disclose or teach each and every element of the independent claims 1, 11, 22, 33, 45, and 61. Moreover, certain of the dependent claims include features that are not taught or suggested by the Li reference.

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected because, according to the Office Action, Li teaches "up-scaling the fetched overlay image data . . . up-scaling being taught at paragraph 79 as decompression."[2] The Examiner maintains that "scaling and compression/decompression may be used interchangeably in the art."[3] However, Li only discloses that data compression may be "pack-bits," and does not teach or suggest that the terms "up-scaling" and "decompression" are used in the art interchangeably. Nonetheless, claims that use this term have been amended to clarify that "scaling" does not refer to data compression methods such as "pack-bits." See, for example, independent claims 1, 22, and 45.

Claim 11 stands rejected under similar rationale presented for the rejection of claim 1. Li, however, fails to disclose "streaming main image data." The independent claims 11, 33, and 61 have been amended to make the meaning of "streaming" clear. In particular, Li fails to disclose "streaming main image data . . . according to a streaming process that continuously transmits all of the main image data at a particular rate."

Applicant's Amendment of January 6, 2006 provided:

> "Claims 5 and 16 include a step of converting the main image data
> from one color format to another color format. . . . According to
> the Office Action, Li teaches converting the main image data from

---

[1] U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0119726
[2] Office Action paragraph 3.
[3] Office Action paragraph 4.

one color format to another color format in the abstract. However, the abstract does not teach or suggest color format conversion. As one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, the term "color format" refers to a color model, which is a mathematical model for describing a gamut of colors. Color models are used to define pixels. Examples of color models referred to in the present application include the RGB (red-green-blue) model and the YUV model in which each pixel is defined by a brightness component (Y), and two color components (U, V). Li mentions specifying the color of a pixel in the RGB model, but makes no mention of converting from the RGB color model to any other color model.[4] Accordingly, Li fails to disclose each and every element of claims 5, 16 . . ."[5]

Applicant does not understand how Li teaches converting the main image data from one color format to another color format. The Office Action did not address the above-quoted paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner explain how Li discloses such a teaching.

---

[4] See for example, Li, paragraphs [0024] and [0044].
[5] Amendment of January 6, 2006, Page 17.

Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-77 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectively requests that claims 1-77 be allowed, and this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard A. Wilhelm
Reg. 48,786
Of Attorneys for Applicant

Dated: July 5, 2006

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178